



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/735,689 | 12/16/2003 | Jun Fujimoto | 246661US2 | 3549 |
| 22850 | 7590 | 02/12/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. | | | | THOMAS, ERIC M |
| 1940 DUKE STREET | | | | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | 3714 | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 02/12/2008 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

| | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/735,689 | FUJIMOTO, JUN | |
| | Examiner Eric M. Thomas | Art Unit 3714 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/22/07</u> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ 5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application 6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
|---|--|

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This is in response to the amendments filed on 11/16/07; claims 1 and 11 have been amended and claims 12 – 20 have been added. Claims 1 – 20 are now pending in the current application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 - 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karmarkar (U.S. 6,508,709) in view of Walker (U.S. 6,293,866).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Karmarkar provides a system capable of providing information on a game arcade, (col. 9, lines 47 – 50, 62), or hotel, (col. 14, line 26), that discloses a plurality of cameras in the game arcade for taking images of a situation in a game arcade, (col. 6, lines 23 – 39), while the images taken are shown on a display or video source in guest room in the hotel (col. 7, lines 47 – 50 and fig. 8).

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Karmarkar's system also allows selection of the images taken by a user's input (col. 6, lines 47 – 55).

Regarding claims 3, 4, 13, and 14, Karmarkar provides a system that is capable of identifying the first and second identifier or the individual live player and the gaming machine, (col. 5, lines 61 – 64, col. 6, lines 23 - 39), but is silent on using a card identification system. In a related art, however, Walker provides a system that discloses a card system that is used to identify the user and the gaming machine in the game arcade area (see abstract, col. 3, lines 34 – 44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add a card identification system into the system provided by Karmarkar in order to provide an added incentive to participate play games in the game arcade to reward those players who frequently play arcade games.

Regarding claims 5 and 15, Karmarkar provides a system that is capable of identifying the individual live player, but is silent on whether identification process includes any of the players' personal information. In a related art, however, Walker provides a system that discloses information on players that includes a player identification number and name of the user (col. 4, lines 40 – 47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add a personal identification process of a player into the system of Karmarkar in order for a player to customize a game to their playing preferences.

Regarding claims 6, 7, 16, and 17, Karmarkar is silent on a tabulating means for managing the second identifier from a card from a gaming machine. In a related art, however, Walker provides a system wherein the tabulating means for each gaming machine could be read from a tracking card and displayed on the gaming machine

(col. 4, lines 40 – 47, col. 6, lines 10 – 12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a tabulating means for managing the second identifier in order to track the player's performance while using the gaming machine.

Regarding claims 8 and 18, Karmarkar provides a system wherein the displaying means controls at least one electric device (col. 7, lines 19 – 27).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Karmarkar provides a system wherein the electric device controlled by the displaying means is audio or video equipment (col. 7, lines 19 – 27).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Karmarkar provides a system wherein the displaying means is connected to the Internet (col. 8, lines 21 – 23).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/16/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, applicant argues that "Karmarkar fails to describe the "situation including a game, a gaming machine and information of the game arcade other than the game and the gaming machine" and displaying means for displaying the images of the situation." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Karmarkar teaches a feature when a player uses the remote video player of the system to view the entire casino property, which enables the area live, wherein the content could be displayed on the display means, thus satisfying the limitations of allowing the player to view images of game situations, the gaming machine, and other information of the gaming area that

may be of interest to the player (col. 16, line 60 - col. 17, line 15). For the reasons stated above, the arguments presented by the applicant are deemed not to be persuasive.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric M. Thomas whose telephone number is (571) 272-1699. The examiner can normally be reached on 7a.m. - 3p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



ROBERT E. PEZZUTO
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER